

REMARKS

Claims 17, 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Takeda et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because the cited reference is not “by another” as required in §102(e).

As shown in the enclosed §132 Declaration, both the subject matter (Figs. 33, 34 and 44) of the cited Takeda et al. reference that the Examiner relied on in the rejection, and the subject matter described in claims 17, 18 and 21 were invented by the same inventor, Takahiro Sasaki. Therefore, the cited reference is not “by another” as required in 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Accordingly, the rejection is now believed to have been overcome.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 36 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Takeda et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the same reason given above traversing the rejection of claim 17, from which claim 20 depends.

Claims 17-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koma in view Takeda et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the cited reference is not “by another” as required in §102(e).

The subject matter shown in Figs. 45A and 45B of Takeda et al. which the Examiner relied on in the rejection was also invented by the inventor of the subject application, Takahiro Sasaki, as shown in the enclosed §132 Declaration. Therefore, the Takeda et al. reference is not “by another” as required in 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Accordingly, this rejection is now believed to have been overcome.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. The Examiner should contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



B. Joe Kim

Registration No. 41,895

August 30, 2004

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978